

WORKERS UNION

JAN 1971

Watergate, JFK murder conspiracy surface

Fierce faction fight

CIA

By ANDY STAPP

DECEMBER 29—The venomous and Machiavellian struggle between contending factions of the ruling class, which broke to the surface with Watergate, has now spilled over into a fight over the super-secret and immensely powerful Central Intelligence Agency.

A full-scale purge of the agency appears to be underway. It was triggered by a series of front-page exposés in the New York Times revealing that Nixon's CIA boss, Richard Helms, had carried out massive surveillance of U.S. citizens, employing mail interception, bugging, and even break-ins.

HUSTON MEMORANDUM

The latest disclosures reveal that the notorious Huston memorandum, a document brought to light by the Watergate hearings and denounced by the Senate Watergate committee for its "gestapo mentality," was indeed implemented. The Huston memorandum was ordered drawn up by Nixon in June 1970. It laid the basis for the various intelligence agencies—the CIA, the FBI, the National Security Agency, and the three military intelligence departments—to begin illegal and fascist operations inside the U.S., with the ultimate goal of a total police state under Nixon's control.

Although Nixon denied the plan was ever implemented, claiming it was scrapped after 5 days because of resistance by the FBI, it is now obvious that the CIA at least began to carry it out. It went so far that even Senators were put under surveillance as possible "traitors."

So far few of the specifics have been brought to light. But it was revealed in the Times, and has been corroborated by Senator Proxmire, that the CIA had begun "investigations" of at least 10,000 American citizens, all of them active in either the anti-war movement or the Black liberation struggle, or both.

CIA AND WATERGATE

In light of all this, it strains the credulity to believe that the five "former" CIA agents caught inside the Watergate were acting without permission of the agency. In any case, it is an established fact that Vernon Walters, then deputy director of the CIA, directly intervened to stop an FBI investigation of the break-in.

'COUNTER-INTELLIGENCE'

The man with direct responsibility for carrying out these secret police operations against thousands of Americans—all in direct violation of U.S. law—was the CIA's counter-intelligence chief, James Angleton. According to the New York Times, Angleton, who was forced to resign after the first Times exposure, is an extreme ultra-rightist. He believes that "many members of the press had ties with the Soviet Union" and was "convinced that the Soviet Union was playing a major role in the anti-war activities." He "saw conspiracies everywhere," the newspaper added.

Apparently Angleton, who kept under constant surveillance 50 high-ranking CIA officials he suspected might be secret communists, was greatly feared for the power he wielded.

When James Schlesinger, the successor to Helms as CIA chief, ordered an end to some of these illegal operations inside the United States, his life was threatened, according to the Times. "Because of his (Schlesinger's) actions, security officials at the agency decided to increase the number of his personal bodyguards." The implication, of course, is that Schlesinger feared Angleton might try to have him assassinated.

'WHO STRUCK JOHN?'

It is in the context of an atmosphere so poisonous that the head of the CIA seems to have feared death at the hands of his most powerful lieutenant, that a remark Angleton recently made must be seen. In the middle of a Times article (Dec. 25, 1974) centered on Angleton in which some rambling remarks are quoted, is the cryptic comment: "I'm not privy to who struck

STAT

James Angleton, ousted CIA "counter-intelligence" chief. Who does he know about the Kennedy assassination and Watergate

The Times makes no attempt to explain this remark. But the possible implications make it stand out like red ink. Is "John" President Kennedy? Is Angleton saying that the assassination of John Kennedy wasn't his department?

Why should Angleton feel it necessary to disclaim any part in the murder, since the case is officially closed and he is not under any investigation in the matter?

continued